

Remarks

This amendment is responsive to the final action dated January 24, 2005. Page and paragraph references are to that action unless otherwise indicated.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 2, which has been cancelled.

Claim 1 as amended is thus directed to a method, performed on a computer system, for providing access to resources (32, 33) for the purpose of updating the resources (page 3, lines 11-13). In accordance with the invention, physical and/or logical parameters required for locating a desired resource are defined, and resource-specific information (e.g., an XML schema) is read from a resource-specifying source (42, 44) specifying a structure containing the resource (step 330). Hierarchical control information (10) reflecting the structure is generated using the resource-specific information (step 340), and access to the desired resource to update the resource is enabled by calling a resource access performer (30) with at least one of the parameters and evaluating the control information (steps 350-390).

Finally, a semantic evaluation by the system of the contents of a resource desired to be updated is automatically triggered when the resource is referenced in calling the resource access performer (page 6, lines 25-26). As noted in the specification, this allows for consistent updates when there are interdependencies between related data, and is of particular importance when the same resource is shared between a plurality of operating systems or generally when the data is distributed over a plurality of locations in a network (lines 26-29).

Arguing this limitation as it appeared in former claim 2, the Examiner asserts that Lennon teaches this automatic triggering step, citing paragraphs [0116] and [0439] of the reference (§ 2, page 4). Paragraph [0116] notes how the disclosed Description Object Model (DesOM) "provides the core semantics of the description and is based on the descriptor entity." However, merely providing "core semantics" implies nothing about semantically evaluating the contents of a resource being updated, much less automatically triggering such evaluation when a resource desired to be updated is referenced. In the latest action, under the heading "Response to

Arguments”, the Examiner does not even address this point about paragraph [0116], but merely reiterates the passage excerpted above about the Description Object Model providing the “core semantics” of the description (§ 3, page 6).

Paragraph [0439] describes how the Shot descriptor D3 “has an associated descriptor handler D4 which provides a method to automatically select a key frame from a specific shot and then generate a series of semantic labels which provide some information about the content of the particular shot (e.g., whether or not the shot contained people, was an indoors or outdoors shot, etc.)” (emphasis added). The Examiner argues from paragraph [0439] that, by accessing a resource using a description of the resource, Lennon “automatically” triggers an evaluation of the description of the resource (§ 3, page 7). Since that description of the resource supposedly contains semantic labels of the resource, the limitations of applicants’ claims are supposedly met. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Even if Lennon’s system automatically generates semantic labels, that does amount to a triggering of a semantic evaluation as claimed by applicants—i.e., it does not determine whether the labels are correct. Nor is there any suggestion of semantically evaluating the contents of a resource desired to be updated when the resource is referenced, as further claimed by applicants. Accordingly, there is no semantic evaluation by Lennon’s system, automatically triggered or otherwise, of the contents of a resource desired to be updated when the resource is referenced as claimed by applicants. Therefore, paragraph [0439] of Lennon likewise fails to teach the subject matter of claim 1 as amended.


Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 3-12 as amended distinguish patentably over the art cited by the Examiner.

Entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the application as amended are respectfully requested. It is hoped that upon such consideration the Examiner will hold all claims allowable and pass the case to issue at an early date. Such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
KARL-HANS HOLDER et al.

By



William A. Kinnaman, Jr.

Registration No. 27,650

Phone: (845) 433-1175

Fax: (845) 432-9601

WAK/wak

SEP 27 '05 11:31 FR

8454329786 TO PTO-AMENDMENTS P.11

** TX STATUS REPORT **

AS OF MAR 24 '05 16:44 PAGE.01

	DATE	TIME	TO/FROM	MODE	MIN/SEC	PGS	CMD#	STATUS
11	03/24	16:42	917038729306	EC--S	02'11"	009		OK
